

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/710,933
Docket No.: 11537-US-PA

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed on January 25, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 16-18, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action has rejected all presently-pending claims 1-3, 5-7, 16-18 and 27. Specifically, claims 1-3, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Daniels et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,303,978, "Daniels et al." hereinafter) and by Nagarajan (U.S. Pat. No. 6,911,736, "Nagarajan" hereinafter). Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pace (U.S. Pat. No. 5,793,105, "Pace" hereinafter). Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giri et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,261,467, "Giri et al." hereinafter) in view of Pace.

In response thereto, Applicants have cancelled claims 1-3, 5-7, 27 and amended claim 16 to more clearly define the subject application. After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 16-18 remain pending in the present invention, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pace.

For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b), the cited reference must disclose all elements/features/steps of the claim. See, e.g., E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co., 849 F.2d 1430, 7

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/710,933
Docket No.: 11537-US-PA

USPQ2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The Examiner construes that the substrate 510 in Pace is referred to as the silicon wafer substrate 300 in the Applicants' invention, see page 5, paragraph 9 of the Office Action. However, with reference to FIGs. 5a~5h of Pace, feed-throughs 520 and 521 pass through the planar substrate 510, and the bottom parts of the feed-throughs 520 and 510 are connected to the terminals 522 used as the leads. In other words, the terminals 522 as the leads are coupled to the interconnect layer through the feed-throughs 520 and 521 penetrating the substrate 510. By contrast, referring to Applicants' FIG. 3E, the conductive blocks 310 as the leads provided by the amended claim 16 of the subject application are disposed on the silicon wafer substrate 300 and connected to the interconnect layer 330, but not connected to the interconnect layer 330 through the silicon wafer substrate 300.

Based on the above reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 16 because Pace does not teach each and every element recited in said claim, and thus claim 16 should be allowable.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giri et al. in view of Pace.

It is well established at law that, for a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious based upon a combination of references, the cited

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/710,933
Docket No.: 11537-US-PA

combination of references must disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. See, e.g., *In Re Dow Chemical*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988), and *In re Keller*, 208 U.S.P.Q.2d 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

As shown in FIG. 1 of *Giri et al*, the chip, the conductive block 121 or 122, and the interconnect layer 126 are respectively disposed at two sides of the silicon wafer 114. However, in the amended claim 16, the conductive blocks 310 are disposed on the silicon wafer substrate 300 and connected to pads 336 through the interconnect layer 330. Moreover, the chips 340 and 342 are connected to the pads 336 through the bonding pads 344. In view of the foregoing, the wafer-level package structure as claimed in claim 16 of the subject application is neither explicitly taught nor implicitly suggested by *Giri et al*, and thus claim 16 should be allowable.

For at least the foregoing reasons, if the currently amended independent claim 16 should be allowed over prior art of record, and then dependent claims 17-18 are also allowed as a matter of law, because the dependent claims contain all features of their independent claim 16. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/710,933
Docket No.: 11537-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 16-17 are in proper condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

April 24, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jicpgroup.com.tw
Usa@jicpgroup.com.tw